

# Collision and Diffusion in Microwave Breakdown of Nitrogen Gas in and around Microgaps

J.D. Campbell<sup>1</sup>, A. Bowman III<sup>2</sup>, G.T. Lenters<sup>1</sup>, S.K. Remillard<sup>2,a</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Grand Valley State University, Allendale, MI 49401, USA

<sup>2</sup>Hope College, Holland, MI 49423, USA

## Abstract

The microwave induced breakdown of N<sub>2</sub> gas in microgaps was modeled using the collision frequency between electrons and neutrals and the effective electric field concept. The threshold electric field at low pressures occurs outside the gap, but at high pressures with a mean free path shorter than the effective diffusion length, it is found to occur inside the microgap. Two very clear pressure regimes are seen, divided by a sharp transition, and each separately fitting the collision frequency model.

---

<sup>a</sup> Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. Electronic Mail: remillard@hope.edu

Being employed commercially and the subject of numerous patents, the application of microplasma is arguably more advanced than the science<sup>1</sup>. Most attention has been on static and low frequency breakdown, with microwave induced microplasma being more recently investigated. One motive for microwaves is the near absence of electrode sputtering, which lengthens the life of the microscopically sized plasma source<sup>2</sup>. Microwave plasma ignition has some key distinctions from static discharge. Electron inertia causes the electron gas to behave as if it were in a smaller *effective* electric field,  $E_{eff}$ . Also, secondary electron emission from surfaces is negligible due to the small amplitude of ion oscillation. In both DC and microwave fields, microgap breakdown is known to deviate from Paschen's law<sup>3,4</sup>. The threshold breakdown of N<sub>2</sub> gas in microgaps, and its distinction from larger gaps, will be discussed here.

Low pressure microwave breakdown in gaps was previously measured with a re-entrant cavity, benchmarked against historical data, and modeled as a collisional process<sup>5</sup>. These experiments have since ventured into microgaps as small as 13  $\mu\text{m}$ <sup>6</sup>. The threshold breakdown electric field  $E_{bd}$  had a minimum around 1 Torr for frequencies around 1 GHz. We will show that the pressure for a minimum in a microgap is much higher.

In these experiments, plasma was ignited in the adjustable gap of a re-entrant resonator. Using Mylar<sup>TM</sup> film as a temporary spacer, the gap size,  $d$ , was set as small as 13  $\mu\text{m}$ . The cone-shaped resonator had a 4 mm diameter flat end identical to the micrometer driven tuner rod in Figure 1. It resonated between 0.75 and 1.8 GHz with an unloaded Q between 1,800 and 2,500. Frequency swept power was generated by an Agilent 8753E vector network analyzer, amplified to as much as 2 Watts, and was coupled in and out through dipole antennas. The electric field in the gap was determined by finite element analysis, using *HFSS*<sup>7</sup>. Static gas pressure was measured using capacitance manometers.

The effective threshold electric field  $E_{eff,bd} \propto N^m$  depends on the number density  $N$  and a power law  $m$ , which measures the extent to which the ion buildup is dominated by collisions<sup>6</sup>. Although questions may arise about its validity at high pressure<sup>8</sup>, the vibrating electron response is described by the effective electric field  $E_{eff} = E_0 \sqrt{\nu_c^2 / (\nu_c^2 + \omega^2)}$ , where  $E_0$  is the applied field. The applied electric field at breakdown  $E_{bd}$  then varies with pressure  $P$  as

$$E_{bd} = CP^m \sqrt{1 + \frac{\omega^2}{(BP)^2}} \quad (1)$$

where the product  $\nu_c = BP$  is the collision frequency for momentum transfer between free electrons and neutrals. The scale is set by  $C$ . Fits of Equation (1) to nitrogen breakdown in gaps down to 13  $\mu\text{m}$  formed out of a cone and plate geometry were reported in Reference [6] at pressures below 30 Torr. Equation (1) fits these breakdown curves well with reduced *chi* square  $1 < \chi_r^2 < 3$ . However, because of the high values of  $E_{bd}$  for the smaller gaps, the breakdowns in

Reference [6], all measured below a pressure of 30 Torr, were hypothesized to occur outside the microgaps.

Figure 2 shows  $E_{bd}$  from eight gap sizes with fits to Equation 1. Through an opening in the housing, low pressure breakdown is observed to occur outside the gap. Equation 1 was fit separately to the low  $P$  portion and to the high  $P$  portion, where breakdown was observed inside the gap. The pressure of the upper minimum depends strongly on  $d$ , merging with the lower minimum for gaps at and above 250  $\mu\text{m}$ . In the microgaps, the two regions are sharply divided at a gap size dependent transition pressure,  $P_T$ . A broad single minimum occurs in large gaps (250 to 1,000  $\mu\text{m}$ ) with breakdown still inside the gap at high  $P$  and outside the gap at low  $P$ . Microgap microwave breakdown simulations by Xue and Hopwood<sup>9</sup> showed that at low  $P$ , the plasma resides outside the microgap where the electron density is highest.

Over the entire range of gap sizes, the ratio  $\omega/v_c$  at the microgap breakdown minimum was gap size independent with a value of  $1.07 \pm 0.06$ , confirming that gap breakdown has its minimum at the pressure where  $v_c = \omega$ . At the transition pressure,  $v_c / \omega$  for breakdown in the microgap is also a constant at about 0.4. Also, when the breakdown is clearly outside the gap, the minimum occurs when  $\omega/v_c \approx 0.5$ .

With the two breakdown regimes merged in larger gaps, a better description for 250  $\mu\text{m}$  and above comes from a two-fluid treatment of the pre-breakdown  $\text{N}_2$  gas. Figure 3 shows a fit to the hypothesis that  $E_{bd}$  is a quadrature summation of breakdown thresholds inside and outside the gap

$$E_{bd} = \sqrt{E_{bd1}^2 + E_{bd2}^2}. \quad (2)$$

$E_{bd1}$  and  $E_{bd2}$  are each individually described by Equation 1, with separate power laws,  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ , collision frequency coefficients  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , and relative strengths  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ .

A well-established empirical expression for the breakdown threshold based on diffusion is<sup>10,11</sup>

$$E_{bd} = CP \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\omega}{v_c} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \left( \frac{D}{P\Lambda^2} + 64,000 \right)^{3/16} \quad (3)$$

where  $D \propto 1/P$  is the diffusion coefficient in  $\text{cm}^2/\text{s}$ .  $\Lambda$  is the effective diffusion length in cm, which depends on pressure<sup>12</sup> as  $\Lambda^2 = \Lambda_0^2 / \sqrt{1 + (P/P_0)^2}$ ,  $P_0$  being a scaling pressure in Torr. Two distinctions between Equations (1) and (3) are the power law  $m$  and the ratio  $D/\Lambda^2$ . The power law in Equation (1) becomes unity in Equation (3), as it also is in gap-less microwave breakdown in the open atmosphere<sup>13</sup> and in waveguides<sup>14</sup>. It is the short effective diffusion length that causes  $m$  from Equation (1) to deviate from unity in gaps.

In each microgap, the parameter  $P_o$  in the diffusion model of Equation (3) is greater than  $10^{10}$  Torr, indicating that  $\Lambda$ , which equals  $d/\pi^{15}$ , is pressure independent. The diffusion coefficient is  $D \approx 10^6/P$  (cm<sup>2</sup>/s), and the term  $D/P\Lambda^2$  is thus on the order of  $10^{11}$  at 1 Torr for a 100  $\mu\text{m}$  gap, which is within the range of values found when Equation (3) is fit to the data. The quantity 64,000 in Equation (3) is thus insignificant for the microgaps, reducing Equation (3) to

$$E_{bd} \approx CP^{5/8} \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{\omega}{v_c} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2} \quad (4)$$

With the power law  $m_2$  for the upper region, shown in Figure 4, scattered around an average value of 0.632, the diffusion model, reduced to Equation (4), provides a nearly identical description as Equation (1) for breakdown inside the microgap. Equation (3), which describes parallel plate geometry and diffusion dominated processes, does not describe the breakdown threshold below the transition, where breakdown occurs outside the microgap. Since Equation (1) fits the low  $P$  region with  $m$  ranging from 0.15 up to 0.70 there is no chance that Equation (3) would describe the threshold for breakdown outside these microgaps.

The diffusion model in Equation (3) also fits the threshold for the gaps larger than 200  $\mu\text{m}$ , which do not exhibit the double minima, with  $8 < \chi_r^2 < 145$  provided that the square root factor which contains the collision frequency is included. Figure 3 shows two possible outcomes from fitting Equation (3). In one case, the collision frequency,  $v_c$ , is so large that its explicit contribution to the threshold is negligible, and the square root factor is therefore unity. Both cases fit well at high pressure. So, unless the low pressure data are available, it is not possible to discern the limitation that collisions place on the breakdown threshold. Although less justified physically, the collisional model of Equation (2) has two additional free parameters and thus fits these “bathtub” shaped large gap curves much better, with  $3 < \chi_r^2 < 14$ .

It is evident in Figure (2) that there is a third pressure regime found in gaps smaller than 100  $\mu\text{m}$  and at pressures below about 0.2 Torr. In this higher vacuum regime, the microgap breakdown threshold is lower than the values predicted by equation (1), and a change in mechanism determining the breakdown threshold is clearly evident. This regime, which appears to be influenced by the smoothness and parallelism of the gap faces, is a subject of on-going investigation.


Besides modeling  $E_{bd}$  with Equations (1) and (4), breakdown in and around large and small gaps can be distinguished by their optical emissions. Spectra taken with an SBIG ST-7E astronomical grade spectrometer reveal that the 1<sup>st</sup> positive system of  $\text{N}_2$  is suppressed in a 25  $\mu\text{m}$  gap to within the spectrometer sensitivity, regardless of whether the breakdown occurs inside or outside the gap. In a 500  $\mu\text{m}$  gap, as  $P$  increases emissions from the 2<sup>nd</sup> positive system (centered around 400 nm) decrease, while emissions from the 1<sup>st</sup> positive system (centered around 600 nm) increase, culminating in a yellow plasma above 500 Torr.

Microwave breakdown is seen to only occur inside microgaps above a transition pressure. Inside these microgaps, the breakdown threshold model derived solely from collisions using the effective field concept converges on the model that includes diffusion. However for breakdown outside the microgaps,  $E_{eff,bd} \propto N^{0.2}$  and the treatment of Equation [3] does not describe the threshold. It is unclear whether this results from gap geometry or collisional processes dominating over the diffusive processes, or perhaps, a mixture of the two.


This work was supported by NSF Grant PHY/DMR/1004881 and by a Jacob E Nyenhuis Faculty Development Grant from Hope College. Valuable input came from Prof. Peter Gonthier of Hope College.

## REFERENCES


- 
- <sup>1</sup> Kunihide Tachibana, IEEJ Trans. **1**, 145-155 (2006).
  - <sup>2</sup> F. Iza and J. Hopwood, Plasma Sources Sci. Technol., **14**, 397-406 (2005).
  - <sup>3</sup> A. Venkatramam and A.A. Alexeenko, Phys. of Plasmas, **19**, 123515 (2012).
  - <sup>4</sup> M. Radmilović-Radjenović and B. Radjenović, Spectroscopy Letters, **44**, 146-150 (2011).
  - <sup>5</sup> S.K. Remillard, A. Hardaway, B. Mork, J. Gilliland, and J. Gibbs, Progress In Electromagnetics Research, **B15**, 175-195 (2009).
  - <sup>6</sup> T.J. Klein, Cameron J. Recknagel, Christopher J. Ploch, and S.K. Remillard, Appl. Phys. Lett., **99**, no.12, 121503, (2011).
  - <sup>7</sup> Ansys, Inc., Canonsburg, PA, USA.
  - <sup>8</sup> K.V. Khodataev, Technical Physics, **58**, no 2, 294-297 (2013).
  - <sup>9</sup> Jun Xue and Jeffrey Hopwood, IEEE Trans Plasma Sci., **37**, no. 6, 816-822 (2009).
  - <sup>10</sup> W.C. Taylor, W.E. Scharfman, and T. Morita, "Voltage Breakdown of Microwave Antennas," in Advances in Microwaves, Vol. 7, Leo Young, ed. (Academic Press, New York, 1971).
  - <sup>11</sup> P.B. Bisbing, D.L. McMenamin, A.K. Jordan, and P.M. Scherer, "Study to Obtain Design Data for Reentry ECM Antenna Systems," G.E. (General Electric) Report #68SD591, General Electric Co., Philadelphia, PA, 1968.
  - <sup>12</sup> U. Jordan, D. Anderson, L. Lapierre, M. Lisak, T. Olsson, J. Puech, V.E. Semenov, J. Sombrin, and R. Tomala, IEEE Trans. Plasma Sci., **34**, no. 2, 421-430 (2006).
  - <sup>13</sup> A.V. Gurevich, N.D. Borisov, and G.M. Milikh, Physics of Microwave Discharges: Artificially Ionized Regions in the Atmosphere, (Gordon & Breach, 1997).
  - <sup>14</sup> D. Anderson, U. Jordan, M. Lisak, T. Olsson, and M. Åhlander, IEEE Trans. Microwave Theory and Techniques, **47**, no. 12, 2547-2556 (1999).
  - <sup>15</sup> M. A. Herlin and S. C. Brown, Phys. Rev., **74**, no. 3, 291-296, (1948).




**Figure 1.** The re-entrant resonator includes a copper cone and a 4 mm diameter copper tuner attached to a micrometer.



**Figure 2.** Breakdown threshold for eight different gaps. A sharp transition occurs between breakdown inside and outside the gap, with a clear progression to lower pressures with larger gap. Curves are fits to Equation (1). The two largest gaps are fit to Equation (2).



**Figure 3.** Threshold breakdown electric field for a 500  $\mu\text{m}$  gap at 1.7 GHz. The pressure regions for breakdown inside (high pressures) and outside (low pressures) the gap overlap, and the data are better modeled as two simultaneous breakdown processes using Equation (2).



**Figure 4** Power law  $m$  for the fits of Equation (1) to the curve below ( $m_1$ ) and above ( $m_2$ ) the transition pressure. Equation (2) was used for the largest three gaps.